





**November 16, 2001**

**CR0133 & CR0371 TN & House Number Validation**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING NAME	MINUTES PREPARED BY	DATE PREPARED
CR0133 & CR0371 TN & House Number Validation	Cheryl Storey - Change Management	11/16/01

**Participants/Attendees**

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Cheryl Storey	BST - CCP
Valerie Cottingham	BST - CCP
Pam Shifflet	WorldCom
Micki Jones	WorldCom
Doug Lacey	WorldCom
Sherry Lichtenberg	WorldCom
Graham Watkins	KPMG
Venkat Subramanian	BST

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Sandy Tonjes	WorldCom
Fred Brigham	WorldCom
Jill Williamson	BST
Vanessa Thomas	BST
Pat Woods	WorldCom
Rick Whisamore	WorldCom
Brenda Thomas	BST
Sakina Jihad	WorldCom

**Meeting Information History**

DATE	START TIME	END TIME
11/16/01	3:00 PM EDT	4:00 PM EDT
Conf Bridge		

MEETING PURPOSE
Discuss WorldCom testing results on TN and House Number Validation for REOTY-M



**November 16, 2001**  
**CR0133 & CR0371 TN & House Number Validation**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
1. Introduction	<p>Valerie Cottingham (BST-Change Management Team) stated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss WorldCom's testing results on TN and House Number validation for REQ TYP M.</p>
2. Results of testing	<p>Jill Williamson (BST-Information Technology Delivery) reported that WorldCom submitted four test orders, REQ TYP M, ACT=V.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Three of the four orders had multiple addresses (one working and 1 non-working address).</li><li>• Two of the above three received FOCs on the first attempt.</li><li>• One clarification was generated; however this was expected. The clarification was associated with ADSL not allowed with existing service.</li><li>• The fourth order had a single working address. An FOC was received on this LSR.</li></ul> <p>Jill stated that the test was successful. The interfaces operated as BellSouth expected.</p> <p>Sherry Lichtenberg (WorldCom) questioned the documented business rules regarding the edit against the CSR; if this a new edit as a result of the change. Jill replied this is a new edit with the change this weekend to ensure the correct record is migrated. Sherry questioned what type of reject would the CLEC receive if the CSR and RSAG information does not match. Jill indicated there is a match conducted somewhere between the CSR and RSAG but committed to investigate this issue and provide a response by Monday, November 19.</p>
3. Summary	<p>Fred Brigham (WorldCom) indicated he was satisfied with the test responses. Sherry also indicated she was satisfied with the test and provided concurrence for the deployment of this enhancement this weekend.</p> <p>WorldCom questioned BellSouth's internal testing results. Jill stated internal testing went well; approximately 1800 orders with no problems.</p> <p>Jill confirmed with WorldCom that they would be submitting orders on Saturday after the release to ensure no problems are experienced.</p> <p>A tentative conference call has been scheduled for Tuesday, November 20 at 4:00 PM ET to review any issues/problems that may have occurred after the release. WorldCom will advise Change Control Monday afternoon if the call is needed on Tuesday. Change Control will advise the CLEC community accordingly.</p>



November 16, 2001

## CR0133 & CR0371 TN & House Number Validation

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
4. Review of Action Items	<p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> Provide what type of reject will be sent if the information on the CSR and RSAG does not match.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The SANO on the LSR is validated against both the CSR and RSAG. If the SANO on the LSR matches the CSR, but not RSAG (or vice versa), the LSR will error when it gets to LESOG with G7250 - LSR House Number Incorrect.</p>





November 12, 2001  
CR0133 & CR0371 Change Requests  
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NAME	MINUTES PREPARED BY:	DATE PREPARED
CR0133 & CR0371 Change Requests	Cheryl Storey, Cheryl Lichtenberg	11/15/01

Participants/Attendees

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY	PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Cheryl Storey	BST - CCP	Doyle Mote	BST
Valerie Cottingham	BST - CCP	Fred Brigham	WorldCom
Kim Gillette-Hoskins	Quintessent	Sam Shaw	KPMG
John Estep	WorldCom	Marva Goff	BST
Amanda Hill	WorldCom	Tyra Hush	WorldCom
Sherry Lichtenberg	WorldCom	Karen Schaffner	WorldCom
Graham Watkins	KPMG	Tami Swenson	Accenture
Donna Cain	AT&T	Shamone Stapler	ITC/Deltacom
Rich Bobik	AT&T	Dale Donaldson	epb Telecom
Dennis Davis	BST	Pat Woods	WorldCom
Meredith Sims	NewSouth	Rick Whisamore	WorldCom
Linda Tate	BST	Meena Masih	BST
Gary Romanick	BST		

Meeting Information History

DATE	START TIME	END TIME
11/12/01	2:00 PM EDT	3:00 PM EDT
Conf Bridge		

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the status of the CR0133 and CR0371 Change Requests. The meeting was held on November 12, 2001, at 2:00 PM EDT. The meeting was attended by Cheryl Storey, Valerie Cottingham, Kim Gillette-Hoskins, John Estep, Amanda Hill, Sherry Lichtenberg, Graham Watkins, Donna Cain, Rich Bobik, Dennis Davis, Meredith Sims, Linda Tate, Gary Romanick, Doyle Mote, Fred Brigham, Sam Shaw, Marva Goff, Tyra Hush, Karen Schaffner, Tami Swenson, Shamone Stapler, Dale Donaldson, Pat Woods, Rick Whisamore, and Meena Masih. The meeting was chaired by Cheryl Storey. The meeting minutes were prepared by Cheryl Storey and Cheryl Lichtenberg on November 15, 2001.



**November 12, 2001**  
**CR0133 & CR0371 Change Requests**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
1. Introduction	<p>Valerie Cottingham (BST-Change Management Team) stated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss alternatives for validation in response to CR0133 and CR0371 change requests. This is associated with a Carrier Notification Letter that was posted regarding the November 3, 2001 release for Validating the End User Address by Telephone Number for UNE-P, REQTYPM.</p>
2. Discussion	<p>Linda Tate (BST-Information Technology Delivery) stated that BellSouth had intended to implement WorldCom's change request to validate by TN and End User Name for REQTYPM. BellSouth did implement migration by TN for REQTYPM on 11-3-01. Linda explained how the BellSouth systems are responding to REQTYPM LSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LSR is sent</li><li>• System looks for a valid address to identify the serving Central Office (CO) for due date calculation</li><li>• If address is not valid, the system looks at the TN</li><li>• TN is used with RSAG to attempt an address match</li><li>• If a match, the serving CO is identified for due date calculation</li></ul> <p>In testing the 11-3-01 release, we found that the system is returning multiple addresses 30% of the time. On 11-17-01 edits will be in place to handle the multiple addresses.</p> <p>BellSouth is recommending that the End User Name not be used as part of the validation because there are so many variations of the customer name. Linda stated that BellSouth conducted studies using the End User Name in the validation process and the studies indicated that the system was rejecting 64 to 99.7% of LSRs when attempting to do a name match.</p>



**November 12, 2001**  
**CR0133 & CR0371 Change Requests**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p>Rich Bobik (AT&amp;T) asked Linda to provide additional examples of why the End User Name was not recommended. Linda provided the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Special characters in the name</li><li>• The customer you're talking with may not be the same name that is on the CSR; it could be a business name</li><li>• Incorrect spellings</li></ul> <p>Sherry Lichtenberg (WorldCom) stated that in other markets, they are not receiving these rejects. Linda commented that BellSouth requires the End User Name. BST reviewed posted information of other RBOCs and couldn't determine by the business rules if the End User Name was being used in the validation process. Linda stated that the business need for End User Name is for flow through and to ensure the correct customer is migrated.</p> <p>Linda stated that tests indicated a high percentage of matches would result in using the street number. If a CLEC chooses to provide an address, the End User Name, House Number, Street Name, City, State and Zip would be needed on the LSR. The entire address would not be required. Linda indicated that house number validation was utilized previously by BST before due date calculation requirement changes. Linda confirmed this would be new functionality for REQ TYP M.</p>
3. Testing	<p>Linda stated that BST is making provisions to test with WorldCom before 11/17/01. Not all CLECs will be able to test due to the timeframes we're working under for this feature. WorldCom indicated they would be willing to share the results of the test with the CLEC community. Additional information will be provided after the WorldCom testing has completed on Friday. A timeline and conference call details for the test read out will be provided to Change Control for distribution to the CLEC community.</p>
4. Business Rules	<p>Tyra Hush (WorldCom) questioned the business rules that were provided to the CLEC community on 11-8-01 and the notice for this meeting that was provided on the same day. Valerie stated BellSouth is working to provide the proper documentation to the CLEC community. CLEC consensus for BST to move forward with the house number validation was needed before the associated business rules could be provided for this change. Linda indicated that she would provide the business rules for this change no later than Wednesday.</p> <p>Sherry Lichtenberg (WorldCom) asked Linda if IT would work with Change Control to ensure business rules were provided. Linda responded 'yes'.</p>





**November 12, 2001**  
**CR0133 & CR0371 Change Requests**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
5. Summary	<p>Linda indicated there would be no changes to CLECs' interfaces.</p> <p>Linda and Valerie asked the CLECs if BellSouth had their consensus to move forward and proceed with TN/house number validation. Rich Bobik (AT&amp;T) indicated its concurrence to move forward and for the test results read out.</p> <p>Tyra Hush indicated WorldCom's concurrence for BST to move forward.</p> <p>Valerie asked if there were any objections from the other CLECs participating on the call. No objections were voiced.</p> <p>The test readout conference call will be held on Friday, November 16 at 3:00 or 4:00 ET. All logistics will be provided on Tuesday, November 13.</p>
6. Review of Action Item	<p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> Provide business rules to CLEC community regarding TN and house number validation for REQ TYP M.</p> <p>Status: Business Rules provided to CLEC community on 11-15-01.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> Provide testing timeline and logistics for 11/16/01 read out meeting to CLECs.</p> <p>Status: Meeting notice distributed on 11/14/01.</p>



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
Docket No. 6863-U  
Affidavit of William N. Stacy  
Exhibit WNS-3

REDACTED



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
Docket No. 6863-U  
Affidavit of William N. Stacy  
Exhibit WNS-4

REDACTED





**December 10, 2001**  
**TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371)**  
**Follow-Up Meeting**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING NAME	MINUTES PREPARED BY	DATE PREPARED
TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371) Follow-Up Meeting	Cheryl Storey - CCP	12/10/01

**Participants/Attendees**

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Cheryl Storey	BST - CCP
Valerie Cottingham	BST - CCP
Susie Hillis	Telcordia
Mathew Walker	WorldCom
Doug Lacey	WorldCom
Sherry Lichtenberg	WorldCom
Graham Watkins	KPMG
Peggy Rehm	Nightfire
Dale Donaldson	Epb
Caren Schaffner	WorldCom

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Dennis Davis	BST
Sharon Elcazer	Talk America
Jill Williamson	BST
Rich Bobik	AT&T
Shamone Stapler	ITC Deltacom
Rick Whisamore	WorldCom
Tyra Hush	WorldCom
Marva Goff	BST
Donna Cain	AT&T
Steve Harris	BST

**Meeting Information History**

DATE	START TIME	END TIME
12/10/01	2:00 PM ET	3:00 PM ET
Conf Bridge		

**MEETING PURPOSE**

Follow-Up Meeting for TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371) Meeting
--



**December 10, 2001**  
**TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371)**  
**Follow-Up Meeting**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
1. Introduction	Valerie Cottingham (BST-Change Management Team) stated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss any outstanding issues regarding Telephone Number (TN) / House Number Validation for UNE-P Migrations that was implemented with Release 10.2.1 on 11/17/01. WorldCom was the only CLEC that submitted issues related to TN migration.
2. Meaning of "interim" change that was reflected in the user requirements	Valerie stated that the word "interim" that was reflected in the user requirements was used in error. It should not have been included in the documentation. Jill Williamson (BST-Technology Services) stated that there are no planned changes at this time for TN and SANO validation.
3. Reject 'G9871 Address/TN Invalid, Due Date Could Not be Calculated'	<p>Jill led the discussion regarding the investigation of the PONs submitted by WorldCom.</p> <p><u>Reject 'G9871 Address/TN Invalid, Due Date Could Not be Calculated'</u></p> <p>Jill stated that all of the PONs provided by WorldCom were clarified because the TNs were invalid, not the addresses. WorldCom stated that the G9871 reject message is too vague and recommended that it be segmented to be more specific.</p> <p>Jill advised that today the system attempts to validate the address. If not successful on the address, the system attempts to validate by TN. If the TN is not valid then a reject message will be returned to the CLEC. If this message is received on a migration order, it's <u>most likely</u> due to an invalid TN. If this message is received on a new order, it's <u>most likely</u> due to an invalid address.</p> <p>WorldCom questioned why BST needs to check the central office for due date calculation on migration orders. BST replied that the central office availability needs to be checked upfront to ensure we're providing a good date. There may be times a CO is unavailable due to maintenance, generic upgrades, holidays. If a CO check is not done prior to providing a due date and the CO is unavailable, the result would be BST providing a due date to the CLEC, which could not be met.</p>
<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to submit a change request to segment reject message G9871 to be more specific.	





**December 10, 2001**  
**TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371)**  
**Follow-Up Meeting**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
A. Rejects Cannot Determine Address/TN Working At More than One Address	<p>Jill stated that for a very small percentage of accounts, less than 1%, have multiple working addresses for a particular telephone number. If the CLEC receives an exact match in RSAG and still receives this reject message, the LCSC or CSM would need to be contacted for assistance. If there is an exact match in RSAG, there must be an underlying record issue/discrepancy.</p> <p>Jill indicated BST is investigating having orders with embedded database mismatches drop to the LCSC for manual handling.</p> <p>WorldCom stated that it would continue to monitor these. WorldCom questioned if multiple PONs could be submitted to the LCSC for handling. BST replied that a CLEC should be able to submit multiple orders to the LCSC for handling.</p> <p>WorldCom indicated that it received five of these rejects for the week ending 11/30/01 and eight for the week ending 12/7/01.</p> <p>Jill commented that there are several categories of working service: pending service, dual service and working are examples.</p> <p>WorldCom agreed to provide example PONs so BellSouth can determine the appropriate working category.</p>
B. CR0133 Address Validation	<p>If the address is provided, BellSouth will validate that the TN and SANO provided on the LSR match the TN and SANO on the CSR and in RSAG. This ensures that the correct end-user account is being processed. WorldCom questioned if BST planned to remove the validation against the CSR. Jill replied that BST is looking at this and suggested that WorldCom submit a change request if this is an enhancement they are interested in.</p> <p>WorldCom questioned accuracy of the CSR database and whether BST plans to update it to match RSAG. Jill replied that we do plan to query RSAG and CRIS to resolve discrepancies. We are also investigating dropping orders to the LCSC for manual handling if there is a RSAG/CRIS data mismatch. Jill indicated that BST currently has no timeframes for these items that are being investigated. She reiterated that less than 1% of WorldCom's orders fall into this category.</p> <p>WorldCom requested that BST communicate when the RSAG/CRIS database query would occur via Carrier Notification Letter and accept as an action item from this meeting.</p>

NEW ACTION ITEM: BellSouth to communicate via Carrier Notification Letter when the RSAG/CRIS database query will occur.



**December 10, 2001**  
**TN & House Number Validation (CR0133 & CR0371)**  
**Follow-Up Meeting**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
6. Review of TN & House Number Validation Manual Review	The orders provided with WorldCom's questions dropped to the LCSC for manual handling for reasons other than addresses. However, the LCSC service rep did incorrectly clarify them back. WorldCom stated that for the week ending 11/30/01, there were 35 orders clarified back incorrectly. For the week ending 12/07/01, there were 87 orders clarified back incorrectly. Jill indicated that she would pass this data on to the LCSC staff to reinforce the retraining initiative.
7. Summary	<p>Valerie Cottingham (BST-CMT) questioned the CLECs if they could submit a migration order as expected. Sherry Lichtenberg (WorldCom) stated that the migration has been helpful and has reduced the reject rate somewhat; however, it does not correct the problem with the unworkable rejects. WorldCom will not be totally satisfied until BST resolves the database mismatches.</p> <p>WorldCom questioned if any other CLECs had any issues with TN migration. None of the CLECs indicated that they had any issues with TN migration.</p>
8. Summary of Action Items	
	<b>ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to submit a change request to segment reject message G9871 to be more specific.
	<b>ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to communicate when the RSAG/CRIS database query will occur via Carrier Notification Letter.



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
Docket No. 6863-U  
Affidavit of William N. Stacy  
Exhibit No. WNS-6

**Address Related Errors - All Activity Types except N & T (New & Outside Moves)\***

	October	November	December	January
All CLECS	3.87%	5.02%	2.94%	1.44%
WorldCom				
AT&T				
BIRCH				
Supra				
NOW Communications				
WS Telecom				
ERNEST Comm				
Network Plus				
Advanced Tel				
I D S Telecom				

**Rejects and Clarifications for All Activity Types Except N & T (New & Outside Moves)\***

	October	November	December	January
All CLECS	15.81%	16.32%	12.81%	10.14%
WorldCom				
AT&T				
BIRCH				
Supra				
NOW Communications				
WS Telecom				
ERNEST Comm				
Network Plus				
Advanced Tel				
I D S Telecom				

\* BellSouth filed a chart similar to this one with the Federal Communications Commission on February 14, 2002 as Exhibit SVA-64 to the Joint Affidavit of William Stacy, Al Varner, and Ken Alinsworth. That chart included the CLEC specific data for WorldCom, AT&T and Birch, while this chart expands that to ten CLECs. The CLEC specific data for those three CLECs in this chart differ slightly from the data shown in the previous chart. The data shown here has been corrected (1) to include one of AT&T's OCNs that was inadvertently omitted from the data, and (2) to remove N & T orders from one of the subcategories of address related errors that was inadvertently included in the data in the February 14 filing.

